

DISTRICT COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

DIVISION OF ST. CROIX

SHERLINE WILLIAMS NATHANIEL,

Plaintiff,

v.

AMERICAN AIRLINES, INC.,

Defendant.

2007-CV-0033

TO: Lee J. Rohn, Esq.
Raegan M. King, Esq.

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL

THIS MATTER came before the Court upon Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Defendant to Supplement Rule 26 Disclosures (Docket No. 16). Defendant filed an opposition to said motion, and Plaintiff filed a reply thereto.

Having reviewed the filings of the parties and upon due consideration thereof, the Court finds that Defendant has complied with its Rule 26 obligations and will deny the motion to compel.

With regard to Plaintiff's contention that she is entitled to the home addresses and telephone numbers of certain employees of Defendant, the Court agrees with Defendant

Nathaniel v. American Airlines, Inc.

2007-CV-0033

Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion to Compel

Page 2

that such information of managerial or supervisory employees are not required to be disclosed and that Defendant's disclosures are adequate.

Plaintiff's request for more details concerning the substance of the knowledge of individuals with knowledge of the underlying incident who are not employees of Defendant also extends beyond what is required by the rules. As Defendant notes, its description of the general scope of the individual's knowledge is sufficient.

The Court accepts Defendant's explanation for the redaction of the Flight History and Event Detail Report. The Court finds that further disclosure is not required.

Finally, Defendant asserts that it has not withheld any documents based upon any claimed privileges at this juncture. Consequently, Plaintiff's demand for a privilege log is premature.

Based upon the foregoing, it is now hereby **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Defendant to Supplement Rule 26 Disclosures (Docket No. 16) is **DENIED**.

ENTER:

Dated: April 16, 2008

_____/s/
GEORGE W. CANNON, JR.
U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE